

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upub.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,752	05/26/2004	Kohichi Ohsumi	JP920030018US1	3751
32074 7590 05/01/2008 INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION			EXAMINER	
DEPT. 18G BLDG. 300-482 2070 ROUTE 52 HOPEWELL JUNCTION, NY 12533			CHANG, RICK KILTAE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3726	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_			
	10/709,752	OHSUMI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Rick K. Chang	3726				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Extensions of oil time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ap	<u>oril 2008</u> .					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the conference of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)						
Attachment(s)  1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal P	nte				

Application/Control Number: 10/709,752 Page 2

Art Unit: 3726

## DETAILED ACTION

The finality of the Office Action is hereby withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 7, 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The disclosure, as originally filed, failed to provide support for "forming an opening in said plating layer."

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 5-6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Larson (US 5,160,579).

Re claims 1, 5: Larson discloses preparing an insulating substrate (10) having a front surface and a back surface, and a layer of metal foil f~rmed oil each of said front surface and said back surface; forming an opening (a through hole in Fig. 1A) in a metal foil of one of said metal

Art Unit: 3726

foils and said insulating substrate; forming a first resist pattern (16) on said metal ['oil; forming a plating layer (18) on an inner surface of said opening and areas of said metal foil not covered by said first resist pattern; adjusting a thickness of said plating layer on said metal foil (col. 4, line 52); and forming areas of said metal foil not covered by said plating layer into lines, said metal foil having at least one area covered by said plating layer (Fig. 1J).

Re claim 6: Larson discloses removing said first resist pattern (16 removed in Fig. 1I); forming a second resist pattern (20,22) on said areas of said metal foil; selectively lbrming an exposed portion of said areas of said metal foil using said second resist pattern (Fig. 1I); elching said metal foil at said exposed portion (12,14 removed); and removing said second resist pattern (20 removed).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 3 and 7 (as best understood) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson (US 5,160,579) in view of Shipley (US 4,902,610).

Larson fails to disclose forming a dielectric layer on said insulating substrate and on said plating layer and said lines on said metal foil; forming an opening in said plating layer; and performing plating on said opening.

Shipley discloses forming a dielectric layer (3) on a substrate (2) and on said lines (1); forming an opening (openings above 1 in Fig. 2) in said dielectric layer on the land; and performing plating on said opening (6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Larson by forming a dielectric layer on said insulating substrate and on said plating layer and said lines on said metal foil; forming an opening in said plating layer; and performing plating on said opening to the Larson's PCB, as taught by Shipley, for the purpose of electrically communicating the inner circuits to the exterior circuits.

7. Claims 2 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson (US 5,160,579) in view of Tamm et al (US 5,666,722).

Larson fails to disclose polishing a surface of said plating layer.

Tamm discloses polishing a surface of said plating layer (Fig. 2f).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Larson by polishing a surface of said plating layer to the Larson's PCB, as taught by Tamm, for the purpose of meeting the electrical requirements of the final circuit.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson (US 5,160,579)/Tamm et al (US 5,666,722) as applied to claims 1-2 above, and further in view of Shipley (US 4,902,610).

Larson/Tamm fail to disclose forming a dielectric layer on said insulating substrate and on said plating layer and said lines on said metal foil; forming an opening in said plating layer; and performing plating on said opening.

Shipley discloses forming a dielectric layer (3) on a substrate (2) and on said lines (1); forming an opening (openings above 1 in Fig. 2) in said dielectric layer on the land; and performing plating on said opening (6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Larson/Tamm by forming a dielectric layer on said insulating substrate and on said plating layer and said lines on said metal foil; forming an opening in said plating layer; and performing plating on said opening to the Larson/Tamm's PCB, as taught by Shipley, for the purpose of electrically communicating the inner circuits to the exterior circuits.

9. Claim 10, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson (US 5,160,579)/Shipley (US 4,902,610) as applied to claims 5 and 7 above, and further in view of Tamm et al (US 5,666,722).

Larson/Shipley fail to disclose polishing a surface of said plating layer.

Tamm discloses polishing a surface of said plating layer (Fig. 2f).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Larson/Shipley by polishing a surface of said plating layer to the Larson/Shipley's PCB, as taught by Tamm, for the purpose of meeting the electrical requirements of the final circuit.

10. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson (US 5,160,579)/Tamm et al (US 5,666,722) as applied to claims 5-6, 8-9 above, and further in view of Asai et al (US 6,828,510).

Larson/Tamm fail to disclose polishing using a belt sander.

Asai discloses polishing using a belt sander (col. 23, line 49).

Art Unit: 3726

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Larson/Tamm by polishing using a belt sander to the Larson/Tamm's PCB, as taught by Asai, for the purpose of meeting the electrical requirements of the final circuit.

11. Claim 13, as best understood, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Larson (US 5,160,579)/Shipley (US 4,902,610)/Tamm et al (US 5,666,722) as applied to claims 5-7, 10 above, and further in view of Asai et al (US 6,828,510).

Larson/Shipley/Tamm fail to disclose polishing using a belt sander.

Asai discloses polishing using a belt sander (col. 23, line 49).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Larson/Shipley/Tamm by polishing using a belt sander to the Larson/Shipley/Tamm's PCB, as taught by Asai, for the purpose of meeting the electrical requirements of the final circuit.

# Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 4/10/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### Conclusion

13. Please provide reference numerals (either in parentheses next to the claimed limitation or in a table format with one column listing the claimed limitation and another column listing corresponding reference numerals in the remark section of the response to the Office Action) to all the claimed limitations as well as support in the disclosure for better clarity (optional). Applicants are duly reminded that a full and proper response to this Office Action that includes any amendment to the claims and specification of the application as originally filed requires that

Art Unit: 3726

the applicant point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure, including the claims. See 37 CFR 1.111 and MPEP 2163.06.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rick K. Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4564. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30 AM to 1:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rick K. Chang/ Primary Examiner, A.U. 3726 Application/Control Number: 10/709,752

Page 8

Art Unit: 3726

RC

May 2, 2008